



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,920	03/26/2004	Ruediger Stendel	1194-280	6751
6449	7590	12/22/2009		
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.			EXAMINER	
1425 K STREET, N.W.			TRAN, SUSAN T	
SUITE 800				
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1615	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
12/22/2009	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/809,920	Applicant(s) STENDEL ET AL.
	Examiner S. Tran	Art Unit 1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on **28 September 2009**.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) **1-25** is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) **7-19 and 21-23** is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) **1-6, 20, 24 and 25** is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/28/09 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 20, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pfirrmann US 4,587,268.

Pfirrmann teaches a composition comprising a resorbable aqueous gel having dissolved or dispersed therein one or more water-soluble medicament such as an antibacterial compound. Pfirrmann further teaches the use of such composition for healing an infection of bone or other tissue. See abstract; column 1, lines 55-68; and column 3, lines 17-23. Resorbable gel includes fibrous protein, collagen, and gelatin (column 2, lines 1-28). Antibacterial compound includes methylol transfer agents such

as taurolidine or taurultam (column 3, lines 25 through column 4, lines 1-11). Pfirrmann also teaches the amount of taurolidine is from 0.5% to 5% by weight (column 4, lines 12-46).

It is noted that Pfirrmann does not explicitly teach that the system is also useful for preventing or inhibiting growth of cancer cells. However, such limitation is inherent because Pfirrmann teaches the use of the same antineoplastic agent in the claimed concentration. Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has been established. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). Products of identical chemical composition cannot have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-6, 20, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alt et al. US 5,788,979, in view of Lehner US 6,258,797.

Alt teaches a biodegradable carrier composition comprising active agent, and biodegradable and adhesive polymers such as gelatin and the like (column 3, lines 30-67; and column 4, lines 1-29). Active agent includes an antibiotic (column 7, line 22).

Alt does not expressly teach the claimed antibiotic agent.

Lehner teaches an anti-infection sealing composition comprising 0.5-3% taurolidine or 1-7.5% taurultam (abstract; and column 4, lines 6-21). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize the biodegradable carrier composition of Alt to include taurolidine or taurultam as an antibiotic agent to obtain the claimed invention. This is because Alt teaches the desirability for obtaining a composition suitable for coating medical devices, because Alt teaches that it is well known and desirable to incorporate an antibiotic agent in a biodegradable coating composition. This is because Lehner teaches the use of antibiotic agent such as taurolidine or taurultam in a composition for sealing medical devices (column 3, lines 25-31; and column 4, lines 6-10), because Lehner teaches that antibacterial compounds such as taurolidine and taurultam are the only compounds which until now have worked satisfactorily (column 3, lines 33-38), and because Lehner teaches that taurolidine or taurultam has not been found to give rise to any adverse side reaction (column 4, lines 47-49).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 09/28/09 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-0606. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert A. Wax can be reached on (571) 272-0623. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. Tran/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1615